### REMARKS

### Interview

Applicants' representatives Jeffrey Snow and James Culverwell appreciate Examiner Hylton's having conducted a telephonic interview on February 23, 2010. During the interview, the figure objections, claim objections, and indefiniteness rejection were discussed.

## Status of the Claims

Prior to this amendment, claims 2, 5, and 9-21 were pending in the application.

Applicants cancel claims 20 and 21 without prejudice. Applicants amend claims 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 15, 18, and 19. Thus, upon entry of this amendment, claims 2, 5, and 9-19 will be pending and presented for reconsideration.

# Amendments to the Drawings

Applicants submit herewith replacement sheets 4/5 and 5/5, in which Figure 3 and Figure 5 are amended to refer to the cross-sectional views shown in Figure 4 and Figure 6, respectively. Specifically, Applicants have added arrows indicating the plane of viewing, together with a cross reference to Figure 4 or Figure 6. Support for the amendments is found, for example, at least in the specification as originally filed (i.e., the PCT published application WO2005/016779) at page 7, lines 22-25.

Applicants submit that the amendments to the drawings introduce no new matter.

### Amendments to the Claims

Claims 20 and 21 are cancelled.

Claim 2 is amended to incorporate the language of cancelled claim 20, and claims 5, 9, 10, and 11 are amended to depend from claim 2 rather than cancelled claim 20.

Claim 15 is amended to delete the term "corner-shaped,"

Claim 18 is re-written in independent form to include the language of claim 15, and claim 19 is amended for consistency with amended claim 18.

Amendment and Response Application No. 10/567,891 Attorney Docket No. F1L-001 Page 7 of 9

Applicants submit that the amendments to the claims introduce no new matter.

### Drawing Objections

The Examiner objected to Figure 5 as allegedly failing to show each and every claimed feature (i.e., the peninsula) and for failing to show every reference number referred to in the specification (i.e., number 50, corresponding to the peninsula). As discussed during the interview, pending Figure 5—submitted on September 23, 2009 and approved in the Office Action—shows reference number 50, which points to the peninsula of the removable part. Thus, Applicants believe no drawing amendments are required in this regard. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

The Examiner also objected to Figures 3 and 5 as failing, by themselves, to indicate to which figures the sections lines refer. Accordingly, Applicants enclose replacement sheets 4/5 and 5/5, in which Figures 3 and 5 have been amended to refer to the cross-sectional views shown in Figures 4 and 6, respectively. Applicants believe the amendments to Figures 3 and 5 address the objection. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

#### Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to independent claim 18 as being improper for referring back to another independent claim. Applicants have amended claim 18 to recite the language of claim 15 instead of depending from claim 15. In addition, claim 19 has been amended for consistency with amended claim 18. Applicants believe the amendments to claim 18 address the objection, and that claim 19 is also allowable as depending from an allowable claim 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claim 15 as being indefinite for reciting the term "corner-shaped," but considered claim 15 and dependent clams 16-19 otherwise to be in condition for allowance.

Prior to this amendment, claim 15 recited, in relevant part, "a removable part having a corner-shaped peninsula." Cancelled claim 20 contained a similar phrase, but did not recite the term "corner-shaped," and therefore was not rejected for indefiniteness. Accordingly, Applicants

Amendment and Response Application No. 10/567,891 Attorney Docket No. F1L-001 Page 8 of 9

have amended claim 15 to remove the term "corner-shaped" and believe the amendment addresses the rejection. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15. In addition, dependent claims 16-19 are believed to be allowable as depending from allowable claim 15.

# Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 11, 14, 20 and 21 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,692,635 to Farrell et al. The cancellation of claim 20 and 21 renders the rejection moot as to claims 20 and 21.

Claims 10, 11, and 14 have been amended to depend from amended claim 2, as discussed in more detail below, and are believed to be allowable as depending from an allowable base claim 2. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

## Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 2, 5, 9, 12, and 13 as depending from a rejected base claim (claim 20), but considered these claims allowable if re-written in independent form to include the features of the rejected base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's making this suggestion. Accordingly, Applicants have re-written claim 2 in independent form to include the features of cancelled claim 20. In addition, claims 5, 9, and 10 have been amended to depend from claim 2 and are believed to be allowable as depending from an allowable base claim

Since claim 2 is considered allowable as re-written, claims 10, 11, and 14 have been amended to depend directly or indirectly from claim 2, rather than from cancelled claim 20. Applicants believe that claims 10, 11, and 14 are now allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10, 11, and 14.

Amendment and Response Application No. 10/567,891 Attorney Docket No. F1L-001 Page 9 of 9

## Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if the Examiner believes an interview could advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 5, 2010 /James A. Culverwell/

> James A. Culverwell Registration No.: 58,175 Attorney for Applicants

K&L GATES LLP State Street Financial Center One Lincoln Street Boston, Massachusetts 02111-2950 Tel. No.: (617) 951-9052